

To: Rueda, Helen[Rueda.Helen@epa.gov]; Croxton, Dave[Croxton.David@epa.gov]
Cc: Owens, Kim[Owens.Kim@epa.gov]
From: Cope, Ben
Sent: Fri 5/3/2013 10:59:22 PM
Subject: RE: some P.O. followup

Thanks Helen for the update and I stand corrected. I just found a portion of a 2007 staff report by Bob Steed, which I only have in hard copy for some reason (and I'm missing the figures...). He looked at the data in 13 different ways and found compliance with ID WQS for 12 of those 13 analyses. The one exception was when he looked at Aug 8, 2004, when "maximum entrainment of Pend Oreille Lake's hypolimnion is occurring". In 2% of the segments, the existing condition was above the criterion (22 deg C) and also higher than natural temperatures (by 0.3 to 0.7 deg C). There's no discussion of how this one day exceedance might be expressed as a TMDL allocation.

Nonresponsive

-BC

From: Rueda, Helen
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 3:23 PM
To: Croxton, Dave
Cc: Owens, Kim; Cope, Ben
Subject: RE: some P.O. followup

I will contact Tony and set something up and talk to Jim.

I did find out that Idaho does not necessarily see the Pend Oreille as unimpaired for

temperature. They haven't gotten so far in their analysis as to make a determination.

They might be starting the TMDL back up soon, will know more on Monday.

Nonresponsive

Nonresponsive

From: Croxton, Dave
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 2:05 PM
To: Rueda, Helen
Subject: some P.O. followup

Hi Helen,

Couple follow-up items to check with you.

- 1) Assuming we will take the lead in establishing the technical meeting with Ecology. Any analysis materials we provide to Ecology will likely need to be shared with Kalispels.
- 2) Could you give Zokan an update? Opalski and Deane talked yesterday and reached a good understanding of next step being technical meeting and then hopefully 3-party meeting after that.

Thanks